Decision 12-04-043 April 19, 2012

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas & Electric Company To Revise Its Electric Marginal Costs, Revenue Allocation, and Rate Design, including Real Time Pricing, to Revise its Customer Energy Statements, and to Seek Recovery of Incremental Expenditures. (U39M)	Application 10-03-014 (Filed March 22, 2010)

DECISION AWARDING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 11-05-047

Claimant: The Greenlining Institute	**For contribution to Decision (D.) 11-05-047**
Claimed ($): $121,053.00	**Awarded ($): $107,928.25 (reduced 9%)**
Assigned Commissioner: Michael Peevey	**Assigned ALJ: Thomas Pulsifer**

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief Description of Decision: Adopts residential electric rate design measures for the next three-year rate cycle for Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), pursuant to its general rate case (GRC) Phase 2 application.

B. Claimant must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Public Utilities Code §§ 1801-1812:

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent (NOI) to claim compensation (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	May 19, 2010	Correct
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:	n/a	n/a

3. Date NOI Filed:	June 15, 2010	Correct
4. Was the notice of intent timely filed?		Yes
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.10-03-014	Correct
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	Nov. 30, 2010	Correct
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.09-08-009	Yes
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	Jan. 10, 2011	Correct- A rebuttable presumption pursuant to § 1804(b)(1) is applied to Greenlining's participation here, as a substantive finding on significant financial hardship (referenced above) was issued within a year of the commencement of this proceeding.
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.11-05-047	Correct
14. Date of Issuance of Final Decision:	June 2, 2011	Correct
15. File date of compensation request:	July 25, 2011	Correct
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. Description by Claimant of its contribution to the final decision (*see* **§ 1802(i), § 1803(a) & D.98-04-059).**

Contribution	Citation to Decision or Record (provided by Claimant)	Showing Accepted by CPUC
A. CARE customers' energy usage; size of CARE subsidy Greenlining demonstrated that low income customers conserve more energy than higher income ratepayers, and as such do not need price signals to incentivize conservation, as PG&E claimed. This is especially true in the Central Valley, but the Central Valley would also experience the worst bill impacts if PG&E's proposals were adopted. Greenlining submitted that the egregiously high energy usage among a small group of CARE customers is not due to the lack of a conservation incentive, but rather from improper use of the CARE discount for purposes more consistent with an agricultural rate. Their behavior should not be considered representative of the CARE population overall, and specific measures should be taken to address it. The Decision noted Greenlining's arguments on egregious use among certain CARE customers, and directed that the issue be addressed in PG&E's CARE budget cycle application.	Direct Testimony of Orson Aguilar, pp. 3-6; Reply Testimony of Orson Aguilar, pp. 10-12; Opening Brief, pp. 11-12, 15, 22-24, 30-34, 38-39; Reply Brief, pp. 11-16; Opening Comments on the PD and AD, p. 6. Reply Testimony of Orson Aguilar, pp. 6-9; Opening Brief, pp. 24-36; Opening Comments on the PD and AD, pp. 14-15. pp. 40-41.	Yes. Greenlining developed a unique portion of the record regarding energy use by California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) program customers which helped inform the Commission's decision. The information outlined here supports Greenlining's advocacy on specific rate design issues addressed in the decision.

B. Excessive bill impacts; energy burden on CARE customers Greenlining argued that low and lower income ratepayers would be disproportionately harmed by PG&E's proposals because they are already conservationist. As such, they have less discretionary energy use to trim in order to avoid rate impacts. Disconnection and arrearage data demonstrates that they are also the population least able to afford increased bills. They would suffer these impacts in order to reduce rates for customers using energy more excessively, despite state policies that promote conservation through price signals in rates and the fact that these households have already received rate decreases. Greenlining emphasized that California law requires that CARE customers not be unduly burdened or jeopardized by energy costs, and that PG&E's proposals would run contrary to this policy. In contrast, there is no statutory support for the cost-of-service argument used by PG&E and its supporters to justify moving away from existing policies promoting conservation and basic energy affordability. Greenlining demonstrated that many low and lower income households have a disproportionate energy burden because they have larger households, making higher usage unavoidable. The burden is worst for households in the Central Valley, which would be disproportionately harmed by PG&E's proposals.	Direct Testimony of Orson Aguilar, pp. 2-3, 7-9; Reply Testimony of Orson Aguilar, p. 2; Opening Brief, pp. 2-11, 13-14; Reply Brief, pp. 2-9; Opening Comments on the PD and AD, pp. 2-7, 9-12; Reply Comments on the PD and AD, pp. 1-2. Direct Testimony of Orson Aguilar, pp. 6-7; Reply Testimony of Orson Aguilar, pp. 5-6; Opening Brief, pp. 12, 15, 37-38.	Yes. Greenlining developed a unique portion of the record regarding the impact of significant rate increases on CARE and low income customers that helped inform the Commission's decision. The information outlined here supports Greenlining's advocacy on specific issues addressed in the decision, such as whether to adopt PG&E's proposals for a residential fixed customer charge or the addition of a Tier 3 rate for CARE customers.

C. Customer charge proposal – bill impacts, conservation impacts Greenlining argued that the customer charge would be unduly burdensome to CARE customers, especially to those who already conserve as much as possible to keep costs low. It would be unavoidable regardless of how much a household conserved. Further, it would serve to lower costs for households using energy excessively, by lowering upper-tier rates and collapsing the higher tiers. This would decrease the conservation incentive for those tiers. Greenlining submitted that the elimination of the minimum usage charge does not benefit CARE customers in a manner that would mitigate the harm the customer charge would impose. Greenlining supported TURN's argument that the customer charge is contrary to current law and policy. The Decision rejects the customer charge proposal as being contrary to Cal. Pub. Util. Code §§ 739.1(b)(2) and 739.9(a). It also rejected it on policy grounds, finding it would produce unacceptable rate impacts on those able to afford it, and would serve as a conservation disincentive.	PHC Statement, pp. 1-2; Direct Testimony of Orson Aguilar, pp. 1, 9-12; Opening Brief, pp. 1, 16-19; Reply Brief, p. 9; Opening Comments on the PD and AD, pp. 7-8. pp. 18-35.	Yes. The Commission agreed with Greenlining and other parties that a residential fixed customer charge proposal was not permitted by statute. Moreover, we agreed with Greenlining and other parties that the proposed charge should be denied on policy grounds because it could have unacceptable impacts on those customers least able to afford it. Although other parties made similar arguments, the arguments and evidence presented by Greenlining were complementary rather than duplicative.
D. CARE Tier 3 proposal – bill impacts, conservation impacts Greenlining argued that a new CARE Tier 3 rate at the amounts requested by PG&E (as well as the many allowable increases in the years to come) would increase bills for the many CARE customers who are unable to conserve enough to avoid Tier 3 usage, due to large households, inefficient housing stock, etc. These households have difficulty affording basic energy use at current rates, and would experience	Direct Testimony of Orson Aguilar, pp. 2, 14-16; Opening Brief, pp. 2, 20-21; Reply Brief, pp. 10-11; Reply Comments on the PD and AD, pp. 3-4.	Yes. Although the Commission did adopt PG&E's proposal to create a Tier 3 for CARE customers, it declined to adopt the proposed automatic increases for 2012. Greenlining's participation provided information and argument that allowed the Commission to consider the full range of positions, thereby assisting the Commission's informed judgment based on a more complete record. Specifically, the decision considered the ability of

even greater challenges if a Tier 3 rate was implemented. Greenlining demonstrated that the bill impacts for affected households would be substantial. Greenlining demonstrated that the impacts of this proposal would be worst for CARE customers in the Central Valley. The Decision approved a new CARE Tier 3 rate despite the potential for harmful impacts on customers, but declined to grant the automatic increase requested for 2012, to prevent rate shock.	Reply Testimony of Orson Aguilar, pp. 2-3; Opening Brief, pp. 21-22; Opening Comments on the PD and AD, pp. 12-13. pp. 35-42.	CARE customers to conserve additional electricity if the rate proposal was adopted. The decision also found that Greenlining's analysis of CARE customer usage data raised the possibility that a small group of exceptionally high energy users may have skewed the data provided by PG&E.
E. Baseline reduction proposal – bill impacts, conservation impacts Greenlining argued that low income customers and low usage customers will be especially burdened by the baseline reduction, because it will be very difficult to conserve enough to avoid its impacts at the lower usage tiers. This burden is not justified by the "benefits" of lowering prices for excessive users, which diminishes the conservation incentive of higher pricing tiers. The Decision adopted the baseline reduction proposal, but in discussion noted thoroughly Greenlining's contribution to debate on the issue.	Direct Testimony of Orson Aguilar, pp. 1, 12-14; Opening Brief, pp. 2, 39-40. pp. 49-56.	Yes. Although Greenlining's recommendation was not adopted in full, Greenlining did contribute to the development of the decision. In addition, only a small portion of Greenlining's time is allocated to this issue. Greenlining's participation provided information and argument that was considered by the Commission, thereby assisting the Commission's informed judgment based on a more complete record. We make no reductions to Greenlining's claim for time spent on this issue.
F. Tier consolidation proposal – bill impacts, conservation impacts Greenlining argued that the tier consolidation would disproportionately hurt both CARE and moderate income customers with moderate energy usage (i.e. some usage in Tier 3), in order to ease prices on higher income customers	PHC Statement, pp. 1-2; Direct Testimony of Orson Aguilar, pp. 2, 16-21; Opening Brief,	Yes. The decision declined to adopt PG&E's proposal to consolidate Tiers 3 and 4 and instead adopted the position advocated by Greenlining and other parties. Greenlining's participation provided information and argument that allowed the Commission to consider

with more excessive usage. The effects would compound over time, resulting in large increases now and even larger increases in the years to come. Many CARE customers with larger households or inefficient appliances and housing stock may be unable to conserve enough to avoid these impacts. The environmental impacts that would result from reducing higher tier rates and thus weakening their conservation incentive would have a disproportionate effect on low income customers, who typically live closer to polluting energy sources and facilities. Greenlining demonstrated that the bill impacts of this proposal would be worst for moderate energy users and CARE customers in the Central Valley. The Decision declines to adopt the tier consolidation proposal.	pp. 2, 40-41, 42-43; Reply Brief, pp. 16-17. Direct Testimony of Orson Aguilar, pp. 17-18; Opening Brief, pp. 41-42. Reply Testimony of Orson Aguilar, pp. 4-5. pp. 42-49.	the full range of positions, thereby assisting the Commission's informed judgment based on a more complete record. In particular, the decision noted Greenlining concern that the tier consolidation would provide rate relief to affluent excessive energy consumers in the Central Valley at the expense of low-income customers. Although other parties made similar arguments, the arguments and evidence presented by Greenlining were complementary rather than duplicative.

B. Duplication of Effort (§§ 1801.3(f) & 1802.5):

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
a. Was DRA a party to the proceeding? (Y/N)	**Yes**	**Correct**
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding? (Y/N)	**Yes**	**Correct**
c. If so, provide names of other parties: Direct Access Customer Coalition; Vote Solar Initiative; California Manufacturers & Technology Association; County of Kern; City of Hercules; Lamont PU District; Utility Cost Management LLC; Lamont Cost Management LLC; Alliance for Retail Energy Markets; City and County of San Francisco; Energy Producers & Users Coalition; The Solar Alliance; Disability Rights Advocates; Marin Energy Authority; Women's Energy Matters; Sierra Club California; Merced Irrigation District; Merced Irrigation District; Agricultural Energy Consumers Association; California Farm Bureau Federation; The Utility Reform Network; Southern California Edison Company; Kern County Taxpayers Association; California City-County		At the time of the filing of the Request for Intervenor Compensation, the following parties should also have been listed: Modesto Irrigation District and PG&E.

Street Light Association; Federal Executive Agencies; California Large Energy Consumers Association; Western Manufactured Housing Association; South San Joaquin Irrigation District; Town of Fairfax; The Alliance for Human and Environmental Health; Energy Users Forum; and California League of Food Processors.	
d. Describe how you coordinated with DRA and other parties to avoid duplication or how your participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party: Greenlining's advocacy differed from that of other consumer parties, in that it focused on low income customers and communities of color. Where Greenlining and other consumer parties were in agreement, the parties conferred regularly with each other to keep apprised of each other's work and ensure that resources were maximized and efforts were supportive rather than duplicative. Greenlining participated in all settlement negotiations on issues relevant to its constituencies. This process ensured that the consumer parties were aware of each others' positions, and coordinated their efforts appropriately.	Although other parties made similar arguments, we conclude that Greenlining's participation was in addition to but not duplicative of the arguments and evidence presented by other parties. Greenlining's claim of coordination with other parties to avoid duplication is supported by its timesheets. We make no reduction here for duplication of effort.

C. Additional Comments on Part II:

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
Part II(A)	X		As noted above, the Commission chose not to adopt certain aspects of Greenlining's position. Even where the Commission did not ultimately agree with Greenlining's position, the availability of alternatives for consideration provided a more full, robust debate on the issues at hand. This range of options and perspectives allows the Commission to reach a sound, well reasoned decision, and thus constitutes a substantial contribution to the record and the decision-making process.
Part II(A)		X	Taken as a whole, Greenlining's participation in the proceeding contributed to the decision by helping shape issues considered in this matter.

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§§ 1801 & 1806):

Explanation by Claimant as to how the cost of Claimant's participation bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation.	CPUC Verified
It is difficult to assign a precise dollar value to Greenlining's participation, given the large number of parties in the proceeding and the many issues under consideration. It is also difficult because rate design is a zero sum game – one party's benefit is another party's burden. However, pursuant to Greenlining's advocacy, as well as that of other consumer parties, customers will not face a mandatory service charge. This will save each customer $3.00 a month, $2.40 a month for CARE customers. Greenlining's advocacy around changes to the tier structure, including the CARE Tier 3 rate and the proposal to collapse tiers 3 and 4, helped to ensure that rates for CARE customers and moderate energy users do not rise too high too fast. These impacts compound with every customer's monthly bill for the next three years. When added together, the savings Greenlining's constituencies will see over the next three years as a result of Greenlining's advocacy are substantial, and far exceed the cost of Greenlining's participation in this proceeding.	After the reductions we make to Greenlining's claim, the remaining hours are reasonable and should be compensated.

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD			
ATTORNEY AND ADVOCATE FEES									
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate**	**Total $**	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Total $**
Enrique Gallardo	2010	232.7	$350	D.10-10-013	$81,445.00	2010	227.5	$350	$79,625
Enrique Gallardo	2011	91.2	$370	See Attachment A	$33,744.00	2011	67.2	$370[1]	$24,864
Stephanie Chen	2010			D.10-11-029		2010	1.1	$125	$137.50
Stephanie Chen	2010	13.9	$185	D.10-11-029	$2,571.50	2010	10.3	$185	$1,905.50
Stephanie Chen	2011	5.4	$220	See Attachment A	$1,188.00	2011	1.3	$185[2]	$240.50
Samuel Kang	2010	1.8	$220	D.11-01-023	$396.00	2010	1.8	$220	$396
Alicia Miller	2010	1.3	$150	D.11-04-026	$195.00	2010	0	$150	$0
Ryan Young	2010	2.5	$150	See Attachment A	$375.00	2010	0	$125[3]	$0
Ryan Young	2011	1.7	$150	See Attachment A	$255.00	2011	0	$150[4]	$0
				Subtotal:	***$120,169.50***			***Subtotal:***	$107168.5

[1] After reviewing the basis for rates set forth in Attachment A of the Request for Intervenor Compensation, we agree with the proposed increase of 5% for Gallardo's 2011 rate, for an hourly rate of $370. This is the second of the two 5% step increases permitted under Resolution ALJ-267. Any further increases would be greater than those generally adopted.

[2] Chen was admitted to practice in August 2010. Consequently, we have set her rate for hours prior to August 2010 at $125. For Chen's remaining hours, we find it reasonable to continue to set Chen's rate at $185. This rate is in the mid-range for an attorney with one to two years of experience. (Resolution ALJ-267 at 5.)

[3] After reviewing the basis for rates set forth in Attachment A of the Request for Intervenor Compensation, we agree with the proposed rate of $150 for Miller for 2010.

[4] Young was admitted to practice in December 2010. In light of this, after reviewing the basis for rates set forth in Attachment A of the Request for Intervenor Compensation, we agree with the proposed rate of $150 for 2011, but have set the rate for hours prior to admission to practice at $125.

INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **									
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate**	**Total $**	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Total $**
Alicia Miller	2010	1.0	$150	D.11-04-026	$150.00	2010	1.0	$75[5]	$75
Stephanie Chen	2010	0.2	$92.5	D.10-11-029	$18.50	2010	0.2	$92.5	$18.50
Stephanie Chen	2011	6.5	$110	See Attachment A	$715.00	2011	6.5	$102.50	$666.25
				Subtotal:	***$883.50***			***Subtotal:***	$759.75
				TOTAL REQUEST $:	***$121,053.00***			**TOTAL AWARD $:**	**$107,928.25**

* We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Claimant's records should identify specific issues for which it requested compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants, and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.

** Reasonable claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate (the same applies to the travel time).

C. CPUC Disallowances, Comments, & Adjustments:

Item	Reason
Comments	In reviewing the activities of the various attorneys in this proceeding to determine if the tasks performed were appropriately distributed, we were concerned with the conflict between titles, years of experience, hourly rates and work performed. Greenlining has labeled Chen's work at the level of "Legal Counsel" (2010) and "Senior Legal Counsel" (2011), Gallardo's work at the level of "Staff Attorney" (2010) and "Legal Counsel" (2011) and Kang's work at the level of "Managing Attorney". We understand this to mean that Kang's participation appropriately consisted only of a few hours of high level strategizing on Greenlining's approach to the proceeding. In light of this, we agree with Kang's hours because they were minimal and matched expected participation. There is no explanation, however, as to why both Chen and Gallardo devoted time to the same tasks. For example, both Gallardo and Chen spent several hours working on the opening brief. We therefore find that the combined total of their hours is excessive. Therefore, as set forth below, we have reduced Chen's hours

[5] The correct rate for Miller's time preparing the Notice of Intent is $75 (half of $150).

	on the assumption that her work was duplicative of work already completed by Gallardo.
2010: Enrique Gallardo	In comparison to other intervenors that filed for award of compensation in connection with D.11-05-047, Gallardo, as the Greenlining attorney with the most years of experience, spent considerably more time reviewing the briefs, testimony, and other filings than the senior attorneys of other intervenors. While it is difficult to judge how much time was necessary given the interests of Greenlining and the experience of Gallardo, we find that the time spent reviewing the Reply Briefs in December 2010 was excessive compared to the time spent by the other parties. Not all intervenors devoted time to reviewing the reply briefs, but those that did averaged 8.4 hours compared to Greenlining's 13.6 hours. We therefore reduce the hours for this task by 5.2 hours.
2011: Enrique Gallardo	While other intervenors became more selective in their review of documents as the issues narrowed and the final decision took shape, Gallardo continued to review all testimony regardless of relevancy to Greenlining's interests. Most intervenors appropriately delegated the task of reviewing and summarizing other parties' filings and the Proposed Decision (PD) and Alternate Proposed Decision (APD) to less senior attorneys thus making more efficient use of resources and reducing fees. With over 13 years of experience, we expect that Gallardo would be more, not less, efficient than these new attorneys. We find the amount of time spent reviewing other parties' briefs and comments was excessive. We also find the amount of time devoted to reading the PD and APD was excessive. Based on a comparison to the average time by other intervenors who invested time in the same tasks, we reduce Gallardo's 2011 time by 24 hours.
2010: Stephanie Chen	In comparison to other intervenors that filed for award of compensation in connection with D.11-05-047, Gallardo had already devoted considerably more time than other parties drafting the opening brief. Given Gallardo's years of experience, the additional time spent by Chen, an attorney with substantially fewer years of experience, seems duplicative and inefficient. We therefore reduce the hours spent by Chen on editing Gallardo's opening brief by 50% to 2.5 hours.
2011: Stephanie Chen	Young, Chen, and Gallardo all attended the meetings with Commissioners. We find this time to be duplicative and inefficient. Given that Gallardo has devoted the most hours to the proceeding, and has the most years in practice, we therefore allow Gallardo's hours and disallow Chen's 2.9 hours. In addition, as described above, the time spent by Chen editing briefs and comments on which Gallardo had already devoted considerable hours is reduced by 50% from 2.5 hours to 1.3 hours.
2010: Alicia Miller	Although Miller drafted the Notice of Intent in June 2010, she did not perform any other substantive work. There is no explanation for the role she played in meetings with other Greenlining attorneys on July 28, 2010 and November 23,

	2010. Without a clear showing of how each individual's participation was unique and essential for effective participation, we disallow this time. We approve the time for preparing the notice of intent, but disallow the 1.3 hours of meetings in 2010.
2010: Ryan Young	Young's time in 2010 appears to have been exclusively devoted to discussing the proceeding with Greenlining attorneys. No substantive research or work was produced. We find this time to be unnecessary to the contribution made by Greenlining in this proceeding. While we recognize that Young is new to practice, and that shadowing an experienced attorney will be good training for future proceedings, we find that ratepayers should not bear the cost of compensating for these activities. Without a clear showing of how each individual's participation was unique and essential for effective participation, we disallow this time. Therefore, we have disallowed all 2.5 hours of Young's time for 2010.
2011: Ryan Young	Young, Chen, and Gallardo all attended the same meetings with Commissioners. We find this time to be duplicative and inefficient. While we recognize that Young is new to Commission proceedings, we find that ratepayers should not bear the cost of compensating the orientation or training of new staff. Without a clear showing of how each individual's participation was unique and essential for effective participation, we disallow this time. Therefore, we have disallowed the 1.7 hours of time for ex parte meetings from Young's time.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the claim?	No
B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (*see* Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	Yes

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Claimant has made a substantial contribution to Decision 11-05-047.

2. The claimed fees and costs, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.

3. The total of reasonable contribution is $109,728.25.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The claim, with the adjustments set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Public Utilities Code Sections 1801-1812. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section1807, the public utility that was the subject of this proceeding shall pay the award.

ORDER

1. Claimant is awarded $107,928.25.

2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall pay claimant the total award. Payment of the award shall include interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning October 8, 2011, the 75th day after the filing of claimant's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.

4. This decision is effective today.

Dated April 19, 2012, at San Francisco, California.

MICHAEL R. PEEVEY
President
TIMOTHY ALAN SIMON
CATHERINE J.K. SANDOVAL
MARK J. FERRON
Commissioners

I abstain.

/s/ MICHEL PETER FLORIO
Commissioner

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:	D1204043	**Modifies Decision?** No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1105047	
Proceeding(s):	A1003014	
Author:	ALJ Thomas Pulsifer	
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company	

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Greenlining Institute	7/25/11	$121,053.00	$107,928.25	No	Decrease to proposed hourly rates, inefficient allocation of tasks, excessive hours, duplicative efforts

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Enrique	Gallardo	Attorney	Greenlining	$350	2010	$350
Enrique	Gallardo	Attorney	Greenlining	$370	2011	$370
Stephanie	Chen	Advocate	Greenlining	$185	2010	$125
Stephanie	Chen	Attorney	Greenlining	$185	2010	$185
Stephanie	Chen	Attorney	Greenlining	$220	2011	$185
Samuel	Kang	Attorney	Greenlining	$220	2010	$220
Alicia	Miller	Attorney	Greenlining	$150	2010	$150
Ryan	Young	Advocate	Greenlining	$150	2010	$125
Ryan	Young	Attorney	Greenlining	$150	2011	$150

(END OF APPENDIX)